


## REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Thus, in response to the objection to claims 1-5, the periods in lines 4 and 10 of claim 1 have been removed, rendering the objection moot.

Claim 1 has been further amended in response to the rejection of claims 1-5 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112, by reciting, at the end of this claim, that the single bond is combined with Y. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that this amendment is appropriate, based on the following explanation, considering formulae (2) and (3) in claim 1:



Q is a part of the group represented by general formula (2) "-D-Y-Q", and  $\text{A}^{11}$ ,  $\text{A}^{21}$ ,  $\text{A}^{31}$  and  $\text{R}^1$  are a part of Q. Because  $\text{R}^1$  is a monovalent group,  $\text{R}^1$  cannot combine with Y. When one of  $\text{A}^{11}$ ,  $\text{A}^{21}$  or  $\text{A}^{31}$  is a single bond, Q is combined with Y through this single bond.

In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the claims under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112 has also been rendered moot.

Other changes of a minor nature have been made in claim 1, i.e. to insert "--or--" before the last formula under the definition for D, and to insert a parenthesis before "wherein" to compliment the parenthesis in the second line below the formulae.

Claims 2-5 have been amended in a similar manner concerning the periods and the addition of the word "--or--".

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-5 for obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-9 of Serial No. 11/126,388. The Examiner is kindly requested to hold this rejection in abeyance, pending an indication that the claims of the present application are otherwise in condition for allowance. Furthermore, if a provisional non-

statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in the earlier filed of two pending applications, the Examiner should withdraw the rejection in the earlier filed application. MPEP 804. In this case, the present application was filed May 7, 2004, while the reference application (US App. '388) was filed May 11, 2005. Accordingly, the present application is the earlier filed application.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of objection and rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Yuichi YAMAMOTO et al.

By: 

Michael R. Davis

Registration No. 25,134

Attorney for Applicants

MRD/emj  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
July 21, 2008